

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 12-24, 29, 31-34, 36, 37, 54, 64, 76, 89, 102, 117, 133, 150, 163, 164, 173, and 175-178 are currently pending. Claim 35 has been canceled as it depended from canceled claim 4. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added.

### **Response to Arguments**

The following passages are reproduced from the discussion of the rejection of the claims:

**The current claims address the problem of reducing the time and processing required to both (i) modify all potential base station signals, as well as (ii) compare all said modified signals with current signals.** This is reduced in the invention by first of all filtering out base stations which do not have sufficient strength. Because the modification can be complex, this substantially reduces processing required. As **modification is not even disclosed in Periyalwar** there is no reason for one of ordinary skill in the art to consider this reference.

As discussed previously, **in Charbonnier, modification is always and continuously performed, and there is no suggestion that modification not always be performed.**

Sundelin addresses a completely different problem from that addressed by Applicant's exemplary embodiments of the invention. **Sundelin addresses controlling the transmit power of a base station and does not address selecting base stations from a current base station and a neighbor (see abstract and claim 1 of Sundelin).**

### **35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 12-22, 29, 33, 54, 64, 76, 89, 102, 117, 133, 150, 163, 164, 173, and 175-178 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Charbonnier, U.S. Patent No. 5,241,686, in view of Periyalwar, U.S. Patent No. 6,018,662, and further in view of Sundelin, U.S. Patent No. 6,144,861.

Claims 5, 6, 23, 24, 31, 32, and 35-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Charbonnier, in view of Periyalwar and Sundelin, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Karlsson, U.S. Patent No. 5,640,677.

The claims recite the novel feature of modifying the measured strength of the communication from the current cell by a current cell offset value, the current cell offset value being dependent on the offset information. A hysteresis offset may be used to modify the

Serial No.: 10/030,798

Group Art Unit: 2618

measured strength of the communication from the current cell at the station, the offset being dependent on the current cell being the current cell of the station. In other words, applying an offset to the current cell received signal strength from the currently active call base station because it is the current action cell reduces the amount of “ping-pong” selection activity which could occur at boundaries of cells.

As discussed in a previous response and at length, Charbonnier (US-5241686) discloses a method for optimising the distribution of the radio electric load on a radio communication cellular network at fixed intervals. Charbonnier discloses in column 6 that a synthesizer is positioned successively and cyclically on each frequency (for radio channels used as a beacon route, i.e. base station frequencies). Then for each frequency, the output signal from the modem is analysed to determine if it is a valid beacon route, i.e. is a valid base station, and possibly read the characteristic data of the relay amongst which the value of the field correction parameter (H) for the base station is determined. At this point the field strength or power (E) of the electric field for the beacon route may also be measured. The unit may then compute the difference between the power of the received field and field correction parameter and stores the corrected field value in memory. Thus, all of the base stations have a field correction value applied associated with the available capacity of the base station in question.

It is only when the mobile has scanned the entire set of beacon routes listed in the table of frequencies, including the beacon route of the channel in which it is currently located, that the route compares the values of the corrected field and determines the beacon route having the highest corrected value.

As discussed above the beacon signal of the cell is corrected by a correction parameter value, which is the offset value. Although all of the cell/beacons have offset values dependent on the current capacity of the cell, there is no disclosure of a specific current cell offset value.

Charbonnier applies an offset to each cell and does not favour or indicate bias whether or not the beacon is currently in use by the given mobile unit.

Therefore the claim is furthermore novel over Charbonnier as the present application recites a current cell offset value linked, i.e. an offset associated with the cell being the current cell and other further offset values which are applied to non-current cell signals.

As indicated previously, there would be an advantage in the embodiments of the present application over the prior art in that for the prior art systems there is no or only limited ways to

prevent the mobile jumping from cell to cell quickly as the handover would be highly dependent on the loading of the cell. Thus the loading correction factor has a harsh correction factor. It could be imagined that current cell station would jump from cell A to cell B if cell B was not considered to be heavily loaded but may attempt to immediately offload the station back to cell A and vice versa very soon after. The present invention would overcome such a problem as the offset is linked to the current cell would decrease the probability of premature offloading of the cell communication.

Thus the present invention implements a hysteresis or offset value depending on being the cell currently being used "the current cell" and therefore effectively biases the decision to the current cell to prevent such rapid handover processes from having to occur unless absolutely necessary.

Charbonnier discloses a method whereby mobile stations measure the strength of signals from base stations, applies correction values (which depend on load indication) and selects the base station which has the highest correct field.

However, the modifying step of the current amended claims is only carried out if a pre-determined condition is satisfied. The pre-determined condition is specified in the independent claims that "*the strength of the communication from at least one other cell is greater than a threshold.*"

In the Charbonnier teaching, the modification is not dependent on any such factor and is continuously being performed. This is clear from column 2, line 54 onwards which discloses that "*the field correction perimeter of a fixed station depends on a proximity load indicator, periodically re-evaluated.*" Furthermore, in column 6, line 40 onwards, Charbonnier teaches that "*each relay is continuously sent a pre-determined signal.*" The implication here is that the modification, i.e., correction of parameters occurs continuously. Furthermore, in column 8, lines 58 onwards, Charbonnier discloses that "*the mobile, for example, scans a beacon route every 700 milliseconds.*" Again, this is for the purpose of computer corrected parameters. As can be seen through Charbonnier, in claim 1 in column 16, Charbonnier's teaching of "*correcting the measured radio electric field corresponding to each of said fixed stations...*" requires adding the correction factor each time.

An advantage in Applicant's exemplary embodiments of the invention is that the modified procedure, i.e., the correction procedure, does not have to be carried out all the time

Serial No.: 10/030,798

Group Art Unit: 2618

and is only carried out if a neighboring station signal exceeds a threshold. There is no disclosure or suggestion by Charbonnier, of this aspect and there is not suggestion by Charbonnier as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to do so.

The Patent Office appears to repeat the language of claim 1 with passages from Periyalwar in brackets. However, it appears the Patent Office has misread the current claim as the Patent Office quotes “if said measuring is performed.” The correct language in the current claim is “if modifying is performed”. Thus, the Patent Office is in error in its analysis through misreading of the claim language.

The system of Periyalwar merely discloses measuring the strengths of signals from base stations to see if there are of sufficient strength to add them to a candidate set. There is no disclosure at all in Periyalwar of (i) modifying any signals. Moreover, the modifying in the current claims is performed (ii) conditional and (iii) subsequent to the measuring step.

In Periyalwar (see column 4, lines 23-65, column 5, lines 1-25), it is clear that the comparison step merely compares the strengths from the base stations unmodified, and does not perform the comparison after both measurement and modification.

The current claims address the problem of reducing the time and processing required to both (i) modify all potential base station signals, as well as (ii) compare all said modified signals with current signals. This is reduced in the invention by first of all filtering out base stations which do not have sufficient strength. Because the modification can be complex, this substantially reduces processing required. As modification is not even disclosed in Periyalwar there is no reason for one of ordinary skill in the art to consider this reference.

As discussed previously, in Charbonnier, modification is always and continuously performed, and there is no suggestion that modification not always be performed.

Sundelin addresses a completely different problem from that addressed by Applicant’s exemplary embodiments of the invention. Sundelin addresses **controlling the transmit power of a base station** and does not address **selecting base stations** from a current base station and a neighbor (see abstract and claim 1 of Sundelin).

Furthermore, in Sundelin, in all cases a signal to interference ratio is determined and modified and the base station power is controlled based on this modified signal to interference ratio. Applicant’s exemplary embodiments of the invention do not recite this subject matter.

Applicant does not understand the relevance of Sundelin. In Applicant's exemplary embodiments of the invention, measuring, modifying, and comparing are performed by the **mobile station**. In contrast, in Sundelin, measurement and other steps are performed by the **base station**.

Furthermore, Applicant's exemplary embodiments of the invention provide for the selection of one base station from a number of base stations for a handover. The method of Sundelin is not only for a different purpose (i.e., to control power), but always is performed by a different element (the base station) than performed in Applicant's exemplary embodiments (the mobile station), but is also performed subsequent to a handover, unlike in Applicant's exemplary embodiments where the method is performed before handover.

Sundelin is irrelevant to Applicant's exemplary embodiments of the claimed invention.

As far as Karlsson is concerned, Karlsson does disclose measuring and determining if the signal strength for a neighboring base station is above a threshold. However, this is not performed in order to determine whether measured signal strengths should be modified and subsequently compared. In Karlsson, the exact sentence in column 11, line 25, states "*the mobile then tunes to a preferred neighbour as soon as the measured signal strength for this neighbour is above the threshold set for this neighbour cell.*" In other words, if this pre-determined condition exists the mobile simply tunes to a neighbouring cell. Thus, checking whether a neighbouring cell has a signal strength above threshold is for an entirely different purpose. In fact, the purpose of switching and tuning to a neighbouring cell in Karlsson is very obvious.

Further discussion of Karlsson may be found in the response filed August 31, 2009.

In combining the teachings of Charbonnier, Periyalwar, and Sundelin, with those of Karlsson, no motivation is provided as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would consider, without the benefit of impermissible hindsight reconstruction, utilizing Karlsson's teaching for an entirely different purpose to modify Charbonnier.

Thus, claims 1-3, 5-9, 12-24, 29, 31-34, 36, 37, 54, 64, 76, 89, 102, 117, 133, 150, 163, 164, 173, and 175-178 are allowable over the prior art of record.

The Patent Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and remove the rejections of the claims 1-3, 5-9, 12-29, 31-37, 54, 64, 76, 89, 102, 117, 133, 150, 163, 164, 173, and 175-178 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Charbonnier in view of Periyalwar and Sundelin, or Charbonnier in view of Periyalwar, Sundelin, and Karlsson, and to allow all of the pending claims 1-3, 5-9, 12-

Serial No.: 10/030,798

Group Art Unit: 2618

24, 29, 31-34, 36, 37, 54, 64, 76, 89, 102, 117, 133, 150, 163, 164, 173, and 175-178 as now presented for examination. An early notification of the allowability of claims 1-3, 5-9, 12-24, 29, 31-34, 36, 37, 54, 64, 76, 89, 102, 117, 133, 150, 163, 164, 173, and 175-178 is earnestly solicited.

Serial No.: 10/030,798  
Group Art Unit: 2618  
Respectfully submitted:

Walter J. Malinowski  
Walter J. Malinowski

August 24, 2010  
Date

Reg. No.: 43,423

Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, Attorneys at Law, LLC  
4 Research Drive  
Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203) 925-9400, extension 19  
Facsimile: (203) 944-0245  
email: wmalinowski@hspatent.com

#### **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

8/25/2010      Clairie F. Man  
Date                      Name of Person Making Deposit